

Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi

Turner  
Upton  
Walden  
Wamp  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (AK)

Doyle  
Gordon (TN)  
Hall (NY)  
Kagen  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Matsui  
McDermott  
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Pence  
Rush  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Serrano

Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Tanner  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Wexler

## NOES—257

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Adler (NJ)  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bocieri  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bright  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Butterfield  
Cao  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carson (IN)  
Castle  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Driehaus  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Giffords  
Gonzalez  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

Griffith  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inlee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilroy  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCauley  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMahon  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick

Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

□ 1217

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Messrs. DeFAZIO and RANGEL, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing rollcall vote No. 260 today on the dilatory motion offered by the Minority to change the title of H.R. 2187. I was necessarily detained in important meetings and receiving briefings on the FY 2009 supplemental to prepare for the very serious vote on that legislation scheduled for later today.

Simply looking at the motion offered by the Minority, it is clear at face value that it was not a serious legislative effort to improve the Green Schools bill's focus on helping rebuild our nation's schools but was instead a dilatory tactic and a childish effort meant simply to embarrass and delay. We are not children and this is not a game. If I had been present, I would have voted “no.”

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2187, 21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2187, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 434 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 434

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All

points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded is for debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 434.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 434 provides for consideration of H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. No Member of Congress takes today's vote lightly. In my two terms in Congress, I've had many late nights thinking about our troops who protect all us around the globe—ones who I have met, ones from my district, and others—thinking about how to bring them home safely and responsibly.

Today, we vote to fund them and their efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is not a perfect bill, and it is not the silver bullet which will end the wars within the next year. But it is a responsible plan to support our servicemen and -women and assist them as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot fully understand the next steps in Iraq and Afghanistan without looking at the steps our Nation has taken to get here.

In 2001, following the September 11 attacks, Congress authorized President Bush to take action against Afghanistan for harboring and enabling al Qaeda to attack us. We were greeted as liberators for the most part and even had Osama bin Laden cornered in the mountains of Tora Bora.

But in 2002 and 2003, President Bush and others changed the country's focus from the biggest threat to American security to a country which actually posed little threat—that being Iraq.

Ever since that moment, we have been playing catchup in both countries, trying to defeat insurgencies while promoting democracy and economic development, which are precarious at best. Even experts concede achieving these missions simultaneously is difficult.

Last November, Barack Obama and JOHN MCCAIN outlined two very different visions of our future involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq, President Obama's plan involved expeditiously transitioning authority to

## NOT VOTING—27

Carney  
Carter

Dahlkemper  
DeGette

Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.

the Iraqi Security Forces, promoting economic development, and removing combat troops within a year. This vision is very close to the plan I described to my voters when I was elected to my first term.

In Afghanistan, the plan involved broadening the international coalition, eradicating al Qaeda and the Taliban, empowering women, and providing an increase in troops, is what is provided for in this particular bill.

Knowing full well Barack Obama's military and diplomatic goals in Iraq and Afghanistan, more Americans voted for President Obama and the plans he outlined than they did for Senator McCain or his plans.

Over the course of the past few months, President Obama has put the pieces in place to keep his promise, putting a national security team in place—a bipartisan team at that—of Robert Gates, James Jones, and Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Today's bill is a plan laid out by the President and his bipartisan national security team that finally understands that victory will not be achieved by military might alone.

Many in the House today, on both sides of the aisle, have stated their opposition to this bill before the new President with his new ideas has even had a chance to implement his plan.

President Obama inherited an international mess. American voters chose President Obama and his plan, and it is time that Congress gave our troops the resources they need to complete their assignments.

In my opinion, there are three components to this bill. First: in Iraq, we provide funding for military operations, including \$4.8 billion for lightweight mine-resistant vehicles, or MRAPs, and \$1.3 billion for IED threat mitigation. The bill also provides \$1 billion for economic development in Iraq.

These provisions are essential to President Obama in order to meet his intended date of August 31, 2010, to remove all combat troops from Iraq.

In Afghanistan, we require the President to objectively report to Congress on five critical areas in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Among these are questions of anticorruption efforts, independent security forces, and political consensus. We also provide \$1.52 billion in international aid for development of that war-torn country.

Lastly, the bill focuses on our troops and domestic emergencies. We provide funding for H1N1 influenza. We also provide \$470 million to address Mexican border violence and drug cartels. We also provide to our troops stop-loss payments in recognition of their additional participation in the wars in the Middle East. These troops who signed up to serve fell victim as part of a backdoor draft—and this bill justly repays them.

Mr. Speaker, today we will have an emotional debate about how our Nation moves forward in Iraq and Afghan-

istan. The way forward in Iraq and Afghanistan is to vote "yes" today. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. First, let me express my appreciation to my very good friend from Golden, a hardworking and thoughtful member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that today we will be considering legislation that represents a true bipartisan effort on a critically important issue. The underlying bill, an emergency supplemental funding bill for our troops, was largely developed through bipartisan consensus, and we as Republicans are very happy to have had the opportunity to work with President Obama on this issue.

The President has repeatedly said that he would like to work with Republicans to develop real solutions for the challenges that we face as a country. So far, unfortunately, the Democratic leadership has done a less than perfect job in dealing with the request for bipartisan support, shutting out Republicans and injecting a greater and greater amount of partisanship into the legislative process.

But today we have before us our first real opportunity to come together and work in a bipartisan way. This occasion is all the more significant because the issue at hand is the funding of our troops.

I'm very proud that we're able to demonstrate to the men and women who voluntarily, voluntarily put their lives on the line for our country, that the support for them in Congress is unified and unequivocal. We owe a great debt to them and to their families, and it is very fitting that we should be joining together in this show of support just before Memorial Day.

Our troops in Afghanistan are facing rapidly increasing threats. Our troops in Iraq are working to fully turn responsibility for security over to the Iraqis. Thousands of others are deployed in dangerous places, as we all know, around the world.

We must ensure that they have the resources, protection, and support they need to do their jobs effectively and, as my friend from Golden said in his statement, to come home safely. The underlying appropriations bill will help to ensure just that.

But this is not, by any means, Mr. Speaker, a perfect bill. There are some key improvements that I believe need to be made. Unfortunately, the rule that we are considering today prevents any amendments from being considered. Even amidst this great bipartisan effort, the Democratic leadership has chosen to tarnish the outcome by refusing to allow debate on a number of

key issues. Allowing amendments to be debated and considered would enable us to take this important bill and make it even more effective.

One such amendment which my friend and colleague Mr. ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky, has offered, would have redirected some funding to very important border security efforts. This is a critical national security issue. Violent drug wars have been escalating, as we all know, on our border for months, and we need to ensure that we have adequate homeland security resources. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not allow us to ensure the needed additional funding to deal with border security.

Another key issue that must be addressed, as we all know, because it has been the center of a great deal of controversy, is the question of how the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay will be shut down.

The President has made it clear that he intends to close this facility, and his administration has already begun to move forward on this. Yet Congress has been presented with no clear plan as to how the facility will be closed and, most important, what will be done with the detainees. Will they be moved to American soil? Tried in jail or—God forbid—released here in the United States?

The Guantanamo detainees include Khalid Sheik Muhammad, mastermind of the 9/11 attacks; Hambali, al Qaeda's operation chief for Southeast Asia who planned the 2002 Bali bombings that killed 200 people; Ahmed Khalfan Ghailani, one of the FBI's most wanted terrorists, who helped plan the 1998 bombings of our embassies at Dar es Salaam and Nairobi.

□ 1230

These are Guantanamo detainees, and we have received no plan for where they will be moved if the facility is shut down. We have received no commitment, no commitment at all, for congressional oversight. This bill should explicitly require planning and consultation with Congress so we can ensure that unacceptable security risks will not be borne by our communities and our constituents.

Republicans have repeatedly raised this issue, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership, apparently feeling the pressure to address this issue, would like to self-execute an amendment in this rule to the bill that will place restrictions on the process for closing the detention facility at Guantanamo.

But there are two key problems with their approach here, Mr. Speaker. First, the substance of their amendment does not adequately address the risks that we must guard against. It does not guarantee that governors and State legislators will have the final say on whether terrorists can be housed in their States.

Under the Democratic plan, States can be forced to allow the world's most

dangerous terrorists to be held in their communities.

Second, by self-executing this flawed and inadequate amendment, they are circumventing the debate and scrutiny that an issue of this magnitude demands. The issue of bringing committed terrorists onto American soil—not people who perpetrated crimes who are American citizens, but foreign-born terrorists—on American soil should not be dealt with haphazardly, nor cloaked in secrecy. It must be considered extremely carefully, thoroughly, and openly. This rule denies us that opportunity and fails to ensure the protection of Americans.

There are other issues that should be dealt with, Mr. Speaker. The large increase of foreign assistance funding, while important to long-term efforts to combat the roots of terrorism, should not be considered emergency funding. This funding should be included in the regular budget subject to regular budgetary considerations. Designating them as emergency funds just skirts the tough choices that responsible budgeting demands.

All of these issues should be addressed in an open debate with an amendment process, which is standard operating procedure for appropriations. As I said in the Rules Committee yesterday, appropriations bills are considered privileged resolutions. They come straight to the floor. We don't even need to go to the Rules Committee for consideration of appropriations bills. It is done traditionally to simply protect the bill and the work product of the Appropriations Committee, and then allow for an open amendment process.

Fixing these problems, Mr. Speaker, would make a good and important bill all that much more effective. It would allow the legislative process for this bill, which has developed in such a bipartisan way, to finish in the same cooperative spirit in which it began.

During my tenure as chairman of the Rules Committee for 8 years, every single wartime supplemental was considered under an open rule. Not even one has been open over the last 3 years since the new Democratic majority has been in charge. It is very unfortunate that the Democratic leadership once again is trying to thwart the best efforts of President Obama and congressional Republicans to work together and build consensus.

But despite their disdain for bipartisanship and open debate, we as Republicans will join with the President in support of this troop funding bill, and we welcome this opportunity to work with him on this issue.

We sincerely hope that we can continue to come together on other very pressing issues that we will want to address effectively and responsibly in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and I will be explaining throughout this debate time what it is that we hope to do if we are able to de-

feat the previous question as it relates to Guantanamo. If by chance we are not successful in defeating the previous question, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying rule so we can, in fact, continue with the spirit of bipartisanship to make this important bill even better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend from California. I just would like to respond on a couple of matters.

First of all, we hope and expect that this will be the last supplemental that we will have to do in this fashion so that these budgets for our military, whether it is in Iraq or Afghanistan, or elsewhere around the world, are treated within the whole budget.

So I appreciate your comments about that, but this has been a system that we intend to stop. This is the last one. As it was laid out, we left it halfway finished last year.

Second, to my friend from California, I would say that in the spirit of bipartisanship, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has come up with the rule concerning Guantanamo, or the amendment concerning Guantanamo. Some of the Members of my caucus are going to take real issue with that amendment. They think that it goes too far in terms of giving the President time to develop a plan for releasing or transferring the prisoners who are held at Guantanamo. I know that Members on your side of the aisle think it doesn't go far enough. So in an effort of bipartisanship, the chairman has tried to craft this amendment.

My last point is with respect to the border. There were hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated in the stimulus bill for border protection and border enforcement, and there is even more so in this particular bill.

So three of your points I would like to take issue with. I do appreciate the extension of the hand in bipartisanship.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. For about 15 seconds. I have a lot of speakers.

Mr. DREIER. On border security, it continues to be a high priority, and the situation has gotten worse since we provided that level of appropriations.

On the issue of Guantanamo, Mr. WOLF, a member of the committee, has come forward with a very thoughtful amendment. We are going to seek to make that in order if we are able to defeat the previous question. I know that the chairman of the committee has said that he doesn't believe that State legislators and governors should be able to preempt Federal law. We know, as Mr. WOLF said in his testimony, that there are a number of States that have already indicated an interest in having an opportunity to receive these detainees.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Reclaiming my time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

McGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in 2001 I voted in favor of the resolution to authorize the use of force in Afghanistan to hold to account al Qaeda and the Taliban for their unconscionable and unforgivable acts against our fellow citizens. I would do it again if faced with the same decision.

But after 8 long years, our mission has been vastly expanded and the policy is unclear. It has been a very hard decision to make because I appreciate the good work of Chairman OBEY and many of the items in this bill; but I cannot support the supplemental appropriations bill.

I believe not just the United States but the international community made a promise to the people of Afghanistan, not to the Karzai government, not to the regional powers, but to the people of Afghanistan. We promised that we would stand by them as they rebuilt their country after ousting al Qaeda and the Taliban government that provided these terrorists safe haven.

Everyone I know, including President Obama, keeps telling me that there is no military solution in Afghanistan, only a political solution. And I believe this, too. So I am very concerned when we put billions of dollars into building up the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan without a clear mission and without an exit strategy.

Just as I insisted that the previous administration provide Congress with clear benchmarks and an exit strategy for Iraq, then we should do the same with this administration in Afghanistan. I am not advocating for an immediate withdrawal of our military forces from Afghanistan. All I am asking for is a plan. If there is no military solution for Afghanistan, then please, just tell me how we will know when our military contribution to the political solution has concluded.

I appreciate and I support the required reports on Afghanistan and Pakistan that Chairman OBEY has included in this supplemental. But these reports don't tell us anything about the mission of our service men and women in Afghanistan and how we will know when it is time to bring them home.

I hope, at the very least, at some point in the near future we will have a full and thorough debate about our strategy in Afghanistan. Sadly, that will not happen today.

In preparation for that debate, I have introduced this morning a bill with 73 bipartisan cosponsors that requires the Secretary of Defense to outline for Congress by the end of the year the exit strategy for our military forces in Afghanistan. My bill doesn't withdraw our forces; it doesn't set a definite timetable. It simply asks the Secretary of Defense to outline what our strategy is.

I don't think that it is too much to ask that over the next 7 months the Defense Department tell us what is the

plan for completing our military mission in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for Congress, I promised my constituents that I would never vote to send our servicemen and -women into war without a clearly defined mission, and I am sticking to that promise. I am sick and tired of wars that have no exits, deadlines or an end. We owe our troops and their families much better, and I am deeply concerned about how long we will be able to sustain and pay for an expanded military presence in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know: What is the exit strategy that brings our servicemen and -women home? Until someone gives me a credible answer, I will be voting "no."

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I would say to my friend from Worcester that it is very important that he realizes that he should be voting "no" on this rule so we can have the kind of debate to which he aspires.

With that, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague from California yielding me this time.

I frankly had hoped that we would be bringing this bill to the floor today, the supplemental, following the traditional pattern of appropriations processes with an open rule so that we could come together and discuss some of these very key issues together in a positive way. And as the ranking member of the Rules Committee said, make what is a very good and bipartisan effort significantly better by addressing a few key issues that indeed are of great concern to the American people.

I would specifically like to mention that the gentleman from Colorado suggested that this is the last supplemental. I am sure that you have watched the House for all of the years you have been here, and I know that you are absolutely convinced that this will be the last supplemental, but I wouldn't want to suggest that others would perhaps consider that to be a bit naive.

But in the meantime, I was most intrigued by another discussion I had with the gentleman in the Rules Committee when we were talking about Guantanamo. Indeed, Guantanamo is an issue that will become of greater and greater concern to the American public as we go forward from here.

The rule does self-enact a proposal by the chairman of the full committee that addresses Guantanamo. There are a number of things it does not, however, address in its language form. And, indeed, an open rule would have allowed us to have discussion of the very thoughtful work done by our Members in the full committee. Those Members' products were rejected on a partisan vote in the appropriations process, unfortunately, and we should have a chance to address them here on the floor.

I would like to share a few things that the chairman's amendment that is in the rule does not do. The rule includes language from Mr. OBEY that, among other things, does not require the administration to conduct a risk assessment of the dangers of releasing Guantanamo detainees into American communities.

It does not require any notification, including the Congress, Governors, State legislators, or local communities, as to when and where detainees will be released outright to the general public after October 1, 2009, and on and on I could go from there.

I was very fascinated by the gentleman from Colorado's reaction. He said that is what our prison system is about. After all, we in Colorado have some serious people in prison; for example, the Unabomber. Well, I would suggest to the gentleman from Colorado, those criminals who are housed in Colorado and other States who are domestics who violated our law in a variety of ways—the Unabomber being a nut case, for example—do not reflect the intensity and commitment of al Qaeda-trained terrorists who absolutely have dedicated their lives to trying to destroy our way of life. Those people in the hundreds potentially being released without any notification to the American public or to our governors and local legislators—it is unacceptable, unacceptable that we follow that path. And because of that, I am going to urge a "no" vote on the PQ and a "no" vote also on the rule.

□ 1245

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have to agree with my friend, Mr. LEWIS from California. You're right, there will be other supplementals. The purpose is that these supplementals are not going to become a regular course of business as they have been as it applies to Iraq and Afghanistan.

With respect to your points about the housing of these prisoners, nobody wants these particular prisoners in their State or in their prison system; but on the other hand, we have very unsavory characters from time to time in various prisons across the country. Fort Leavenworth might be an appropriate place. But the amendment, as Mr. OBEY has projected it, is no money within this appropriation will be used for release or transfer. And so the amendment is an attempt to strike a compromise between your concerns and the concerns of our caucus, and that's what this whole process is about.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentleman yield? I would be happy to yield 30 seconds to my friend from our time if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I want to yield to my friend from California (Ms. HARMAN) for 2 minutes.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and tell him we miss him on the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am keenly aware of the economic hardship faced by people

in my district and all over the country and the heartfelt questions being raised about the costs and policies involved in this bill. After careful review, however, I believe the bill is needed, and the policies it funds reflect a change in direction from failed Bush administration strategies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the West Bank, all locations I have visited on several trips this past year.

We are ending the combat mission in Iraq, a policy I strongly support. We are also embracing a strategy for Afghanistan, which makes governance, and not projection of military force, the top priority. Mission success there will only come from efforts to eliminate corruption and help the central and local governments provide essential services to the Afghan people; otherwise, that country will revert to a failed state and a safe haven for terrorists intent on attacking the United States and our allies.

Pakistan is even more dangerous because of its huge population, a military larger than ours, and its nuclear arsenal. This bill funds nonmilitary aid and counterinsurgency training to enable Pakistani forces to defeat the growing Taliban threat inside their borders.

A promising security program in the West Bank is also supported, a key building block to a viable and independent Palestinian state. The bill makes explicit that no Palestinian funding will go to Hamas, which continues to rearm and threaten Israel.

For the future, as has been discussed, funding for our troops in harm's way in missions like these will be on budget and fully debated through the regular process in Congress. This is yet another good course correction by the Obama administration, and one I have long advocated.

This is a sound bill and a sound rule. Vote "aye" on both.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, the author of the very important border security amendment to which I referred earlier, the gentleman from Somerset, Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the border war, if you want to call it that—the war on the border with Mexico—now is more than trying to stop illegal aliens from coming across. It is trying to prevent the flood of drugs coming across and, more importantly, to keep trying to prevent the spillover of the violence between the drug cartels in Mexico competing and fighting for the control of that trade into the U.S. from these drugs and violence from spilling over into the U.S.

Ninety percent of the cocaine coming into this country comes through Mexico, comes across that border. And no wonder the drug cartels in Mexico are warring with each other and the government in Mexico to control that

trade, because there are billions and billions of dollars involved. But already, those drug cartels have infiltrated most of the American cities. Most of the large cities in this country have cells or pieces of that drug cartel organization now in their communities. You read about killings and murders and hostage-taking in places like Birmingham and Atlanta and Chicago and New York—and of course Phoenix—and all of the cities of the West. They're here now.

This bill doesn't contain one penny for the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms organization. All of the law enforcement groups in this country are shut out in this bill, and this rule seals it so we can't get into it. And we are ignoring, with our heads in the Cancun sand, the cartels in Mexico that are supplying our young people with their deadly poison.

And so I urge that we defeat the previous question so that we can be allowed to bring these matters to this bill. And then, failing that, I would hope that we would defeat this rule that shuts these matters out.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in opposition to this supplemental appropriation. This bill simply continues and amplifies the failed policies that have caused us to be caught up in a continued occupation of Iraq and an increasingly large presence in Afghanistan.

Instead of playing the Taliban shell game and so-called chasing Osama bin Laden, we should devise a smart strategy to win the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq and Afghanistan. They will help us to locate Osama bin Laden. Air strikes that kill innocent civilians will only harden the civilians against us.

The Taliban are leading us into Pakistan, where we are on the verge of a new footprint, after giving the former President Musharraf billions of dollars while he was playing footsie with the Taliban and allowing them to control the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Now President Zardari has proven to be weak and ineffective, yet we're rewarding him with more of our tax dollars.

There are two good amendments that should have been made in order: the McGovern amendment, which would require a simple exit strategy, and the Tierney amendment, which would have placed conditions on any additional dollars given to Pakistan.

We should be taking over the madrassas, rebuilding infrastructures, and building democratic institutions that will support long-term sustainability in these countries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation

of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader, our friend from West Chester, Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I told the President that when he does what we agree with, in terms of what is right for the American people, we would be there to support him. The President has made very responsible decisions with regard to this mission in Iraq and a gradual withdrawal of our troops, and I believe that his decisions with regard to his plans in Afghanistan are sound. It is clear that the President listened to the commanders on the ground and our diplomats and is engaged in an effort to win our battle against the terrorists who threaten the United States and our citizens.

One of those decisions that he also made was a decision to send up to the House a clean bill asking for funding for our troops. I believe this bill provides those resources and, just as importantly, does not include politically motivated restrictions that would hamstring our commanders in the field.

Republicans support the underlying bill, and I think it deserves support from Members on both sides of the aisle. But let's be very clear; we will be watching very closely in the weeks to come as some may try to load this bill up with unrelated spending or language that would undermine our troops. That includes potential money for the International Monetary Fund. That should be debated on its own merits, and not as part of a troop funding bill for our men and women who are in harm's way.

I am also pleased that the \$80 million in funding to transfer Guantanamo prisoners from the United States was removed from this bill. It deserved to be removed. And I will once again ask a very important question: What is the administration's plan for those prisoners who are being held at our detention facility? Will they release or transfer them and allow them to come to American soil? I don't know of any community or neighborhood in America that would want them.

The language inserted by Chairman OBEY in this bill on this issue, I think, is inadequate. It will do nothing more than to provide cover, pure and simple. And the fact is, there is nothing in this legislation that will keep Guantanamo terrorists out of America, nothing. And I think that we can and should do better.

Our solution is the Keep Terrorists Out of America Act. Our plan, I think, does what the American people overwhelmingly want. It ensures that those terrorists are not transferred or released into our communities, and Mem-

bers on both sides of the aisle have spoken out against the release of those prisoners in our country.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) offered similar language in the Appropriations Committee where it was defeated. I believe, as we get into the previous question on this rule, that we also defeat the previous question and allow the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) to offer his language on this bill.

So I would encourage Members to vote "no" on the previous question. Let's have a fair and open debate on this issue and allow Members the opportunity to allow the House to work its will, but I understand that the underlying bill does, in fact, deserve our support.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to my friend from Nevada, Congresswoman BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill, but deeply concerned with the funding to the Palestinian Authority and to rebuild Gaza. By giving this money, I believe we are sending precisely the wrong message that Hamas can partner with Iran, attack Israel with impunity, and refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist, all the while the United States will provide aid no matter what. Talk about the soft bigotry of low expectations.

At the very least, we should use our aid to help modify the behavior of Hamas. Before we send more money to the Gaza, more money to the Palestinian Authority, all Palestinian factions should recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, renounce terrorism, respect past agreements, and release Gilad Shalit, the young Israeli soldier who was kidnapped by Hamas and who has been held captive in the Gaza for almost 3 years. Without these conditions, we are simply writing the Palestinians another blank check to continue their self-destructive and violent behavior.

So while I support the rule and the bill, I have serious reservations about funding this and urge my colleagues that we not continue this pattern of rewarding unacceptable behavior in the future.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to another hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations who had an amendment dealing with Guantanamo Bay, but unfortunately, with the structure we've got, it won't be made in order, the gentleman from Goddard, Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from California for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Speaker, when approaching national security issues, Congress has always acted in a prudent bipartisan manner to protect the American people. Last week, however, in a straight party-line vote in the Appropriations

Committee, Democrats rejected both Republican alternatives to prevent terrorists held at Guantanamo Bay from getting a plane ride to the United States. Then yesterday, the Democrats on the Rules Committee rejected my amendment to prohibit terrorist detainees from being transferred or released in the United States. Speaker PELOSI and her leadership team are refusing an up-or-down vote. Do we allow hardened terrorists to be transported to the United States knowing that eventually some will be released to the streets of America?

Democrats have instead offered a fig leaf. Their provision simply delays; it does not prevent. It delays the Obama administration's plan to release terrorists onto our streets.

□ 1300

The administration has already authorized the release of 30 detainees. This is not conjecture. This is not speculation. This is happening. And unfortunately my colleagues are simply delaying the real problem. Seventy-five percent of the population do not want terrorists released in the United States, and 20 percent don't even realize it's a possibility.

Congress should not abdicate its responsibility to provide for the common defense of this Nation. We should be able to speak on this issue. Americans deserve an up or down vote on the question, do we welcome terrorists on the streets of America or not? This will simply sweep the question under the rug, hoping the problem will go away.

The gentleman from Colorado mentioned that we could send them to Fort Leavenworth. I have been to Fort Leavenworth. I am from Kansas. We do not want terrorists in Fort Leavenworth or in Kansas, and I don't want them on any street in America.

So I think it's only fair that we reject this rule and give us an up or down vote on whether we want a plane ticket for terrorists to get from Guantanamo to America.

I would encourage my friends to vote "no" on the previous question to allow Mr. WOLF an opportunity to present his language and vote "no" on the rule so we can have a chance for an up or down vote on whether we bring terrorists into our Nation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Kansas, I know, knows full well that it says in the amendment, "None of the funds made available in this or any prior act may be used to release an individual who is detained, as of April 30, 2009, at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia."

That's what the amendment says. That's what is part of this bill.

I would now like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. America went to war against Iraq based on a lie. We were

told in 2002 Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The previous administration even pursued torture to try to extract false confessions to try to justify the war.

It's time to tell the truth. The truth is, we should not have prosecuted the war against the Iraqi people. The truth is, the Democratic Senate could have stopped the Iraq war in 2002. The truth is, we Democrats were given control of Congress in 2006 to end the war. The truth is, this bill continues a disastrous war which has cost the lives of thousands of our soldiers. The truth is, the occupation has fueled the insurgency. The truth is, the Iraq war will cost the American and the Iraqi people trillions of dollars.

As many as 1 million innocent Iraqis have lost their lives as a result of this war. Don't tell the American people you're ending the war by continuing to fund the war. Don't tell the American people that the war will end when their plans leave 50,000 troops in Iraq. Don't tell the American people that the way out of Afghanistan is to escalate and more counterinsurgency.

Get out of Iraq. Get out of Afghanistan. Come home, America. Come home.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2346, War Supplemental Appropriations for FY 2009. This bill devotes an additional \$84.5 billion to military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for fiscal year 2009. I believe that the U.S. has a moral obligation to fulfill in Iraq and Afghanistan. We must remain dedicated to reconstruction, stability and prosperity in these countries and in the region.

The U.S. cannot be in and out of Iraq at the same time. The U.S. has agreed to withdraw all combat troops from Iraqi cities by July of this year. However, recent news reports indicate that some combat troops will remain beyond this date. Our continued funding of war operations in Iraq only ensures our continued presence and undermines our stated goals for withdrawal by 2011. Funds for Iraq should be dedicated to bringing all of our troops and contractors home. We must meet our moral obligation to rebuild Iraq and support viable solutions to the refugee and internally displaced populations. We must hold ourselves responsible for the death of over 1 million innocent civilians in Iraq.

Funding of expanded combat operations in Afghanistan will not meet the security objectives of the U.S. Sending additional brave American service members to Afghanistan does not increase security and it is not an act of diplomacy. Sending additional troops sends one message: The U.S. is ramping up combat operations. This message only encourages the Taliban and other insurgent groups to do likewise. We have ensured that the months and perhaps years ahead will be bloody. And we have failed to present an exit strategy.

Bombing raids and drone attacks in Afghanistan and Pakistan have inflamed the civilian populations in these countries. Innocent civilians are killed in these massive and unpredictable attacks. This includes innocent children, mothers, fathers, grandparents, sisters and brothers. Communities, homes and infrastructure are destroyed. The number of refugees and the internally displaced continue to rise from the destruction.

The brutalities of war produce more than news reports of so-called "collateral damage." Taliban and insurgent recruitment profits from these failed policies. The drone attacks are propagating extremism in the targeted areas. Former Chief of Staff to Colin Powell maintains that drone attacks are not an effective counterinsurgency technique. If the Administration will not stop the drone attacks, Congress must use the power of the purse to ensure their cessation.

Ninety percent of the resources devoted to Afghanistan over the last eight years have gone to support military resources. This is contrary to the counterinsurgency strategy put forth by General Petraeus that calls for an 80–20 split, that devotes 80 percent of resources to political solutions and only 20 percent of resources to military operations. General Eaton, who trained Iraq Security Forces in 2004, has echoed this strategy. This bill fails to correct the imbalance and continues the failed status quo.

We need to provide for the traditional sense of security by first ensuring economic security, health security, and job security for all. The roots of terrorism begin not in hatred, but in desperation. All people seek the basic necessities such as food, clothes, shelter, good health, and the ability to earn a decent living. If we can level this playing field, there is no desperation that may potentially evolve into hatred. We have failed to meet these objectives in Afghanistan.

Stability in Afghanistan requires that aid dollars reach local Afghans, Afghan institutions and organizations. The current instability of Afghan institutions must be replaced with strong education and health care systems, judiciary and law enforcement systems, workforce development and transportation systems. These institutions must be built and run by Afghans. The current practice by which foreigners fill high-skill and high-level positions will leave Afghanistan without the skills and leaders to ensure sustainable, long-term stability in the country.

The U.S. must partner with Afghans to empower women and girls. Currently, one in six women die in childbirth in Afghanistan; 80% of women are illiterate; and development assistance has not reached Afghan women. We can encourage and foster reform by investing in Afghan institutions that create educational, economic, social and political opportunity for women.

National security will not be achieved through military might but rather through our dedication to supporting Afghans as they build a foundation of human security, social security and economic security.

Security cannot blossom from the ravages of war. Terrorism will not be stopped by acts of terror.

[From the Nation, May 12, 2009]

THE POLITICS OF ESCALATION

(By Tom Hayden and Joseph Gerson)

Congressional leaders are cooperating with the Obama administration in quashing any serious criticism of growing military escalation in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Indications are that there will be no benchmarks or conditions set on the \$96 billion supplemental appropriation before Congress beginning this week. The administration, which once promised no more rushed supplemental appropriation, is rolling funds for war and swine flu into one package, while not yet disclosing how much is earmarked



specifically for Afghanistan. Rep. David Obey says he wants to give the Obama administration a one-year deadline for results, which likely means making it more difficult to withdraw from a deepening quagmire.

The only current Congressional vehicle for dissent is a proposed amendment by Rep. Jim McGovern (D-Mass) that requires the secretary of defense to report on an exit strategy from Afghanistan by this December, six months after Congress has appropriated funds for escalating the war. Even that modest measure, with fifty co-sponsors at present, has met with administration resistance to an exit strategy with benchmarks.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, under fire for what she knew about Guantánamo waterboarding and when she knew it, is going along with the administration by preventing the McGovern amendment from being voted on. Congressional leaders believe that war opponents are not sufficiently powerful to either require a vote on the McGovern measure to achieve more than two hours of debate on the supplemental, which could also include soliloquies on the swine flu.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus has met with President Obama and, according to sources attending, will not be opposed at this point to his Afghanistan-Pakistan policies. Instead, the caucus is sponsoring a series of informational hearings on public policies for the region.

The Senate, with the possible exception of Sen. Russ Feingold, is not expected to question the Obama policies, either.

Insiders say the dominant message behind closed doors is a political one, not to embarrass the president. On policy, one knowledgeable expert reports, doubt is widespread in Congress and "no one has any idea where it will all end."

The desire to protect the resident may shy Democrats away from demands that were routinely made of the Bush administration: requiring regular reports on an exit strategy, transparency in the budgets for war, clear definitions of casualty levels on all sides, application of human rights standards in detention centers, and others.

It is understandable that the economic crisis and high expectations for the new president have deflected Congressional Democrats away from their oversight role. As the quagmire deepens, however, antiwar questioning will rise again. The danger is that by then the Obama administration will be engulfed in the politics of escalation, as happened to earlier Democratic presidents.

AFGHANISTAN  
(By Chris Hedges)

The bodies of dozens, perhaps well over a hundred, women, children and men, their corpses blown into bits of human flesh by iron fragmentation bombs dropped by U.S. warplanes in a village in the western province of Farah, illustrates the futility of the Afghan war. We are not delivering democracy or liberation or development. We are delivering massive, sophisticated forms of industrial slaughter. And because we have employed the blunt and horrible instrument of war in a land we know little about and are incapable of reading, we embody the barbarism we claim to be seeking to defeat.

We are morally no different from the psychopaths in the Taliban, who Afghans remember we empowered, funded and armed during the 10-year war with the Soviet Union. Acid thrown into a girl's face or beheadings? Death delivered from the air or fields of shiny cluster bombs? This is the language of war. It is what we speak. It is what those we fight speak.

Afghan survivors carted some two dozen corpses from their villages to the provincial

capital in trucks this week to publicly denounce the carnage. Some 2,000 angry Afghans in the streets of the capital chanted "Death to America!" But the grief, fear and finally rage of the bereaved do not touch those who use high-minded virtues to justify slaughter. The death of innocents, they assure us, is the tragic cost of war. It is regrettable, but it happens. It is the price that must be paid. And so, guided by a president who once again has no experience of war and defers to the bull-necked generals and militarists whose careers, power and profits depend on expanded war, we are transformed into monsters.

There will soon be 21,000 additional U.S. soldiers and Marines in Afghanistan in time for the expected surge in summer fighting. There will be more clashes, more airstrikes, more deaths and more despair and anger from those forced to bury their parents, sisters, brothers and children. The grim report of the killings in the airstrike, issued by the International Committee of the Red Cross, which stated that bombs hit civilian houses and noted that an ICRC counterpart in the Red Crescent was among the dead, will become familiar reading in the weeks and months ahead.

We are the best recruiting weapon the Taliban possesses. We have enabled it to rise from the ashes seven years ago to openly control over half the country and carry out daylight attacks in the capital Kabul. And the war we wage is being exported like a virus to Pakistan in the form of drones that bomb Pakistani villages and increased clashes between the inept Pakistani military and a restive internal insurgency.

I spoke in New York City a few days ago with Dr. Juliette Fournot, who lived with her parents in Afghanistan as a teenager, speaks Dari and led teams of French doctors and nurses from Mdecins Sans Frontières, or Doctors Without Borders, into Afghanistan during the war with the Soviets. She participated in the opening of clandestine cross-border medical operations missions during 1980 and 1982 and became head of the French humanitarian mission in Afghanistan in 1983. Dr. Fournot established logistical bases in Peshawar and Quetta and organized the dozen cross-border and clandestine permanent missions in the resistance-held areas of Herat, Mazar-i-Sharif, Badakhshan, Paktia, Ghazni and Hazarajat, through which more than 500 international aid workers rotated.

She is one of the featured characters in a remarkable book called "The Photographer," produced by photojournalist Didier Lefèvre and graphic novelist Emmanuel Guibert. The book tells the story of a three-month mission in 1986 into Afghanistan led by Dr. Fournot. It is an unflinching look at the cost of war, what bombs, shells and bullets do to human souls and bodies. It exposes, in a way the rhetoric of our politicians and generals do not, the blind destructive fury of war. The French humanitarian group withdrew from Afghanistan in July 2004 after five of its aid workers were assassinated in a clearly marked vehicle.

"The American ground troops are midterm in a history that started roughly in 1984 and 1985 when the State Department decided to assist the Mujahedeen, the resistance fighters, through various programs and military aid. USAID, the humanitarian arm serving political and military purposes, was the seed for having a different kind of interaction with the Afghans," she told me. "The Afghans were very grateful to received arms and military equipment from the Americans."

"But the way USAID distributed its humanitarian assistance was very debatable," she went on. "It still puzzles me. They gave most of it to the Islamic groups such as the

Hezb-e Islami of [Gulbuddin] Hekmatyar. And I think it is possibly because they were more interested in the future stability of Pakistan rather than saving Afghanistan. Afghanistan was probably a good ground to hit and drain the blood from the Soviet Union. I did not see a plan to rebuild or bring peace to Afghanistan. It seemed that Afghanistan was a tool to weaken the Soviet Union. It was mostly left to the Pakistani intelligence services to decide what would be best and how to do it and how by doing so they could strengthen themselves."

The Pakistanis, Dr. Fournot said, developed a close relationship with Saudi Arabia. The Saudis, like the Americans, flooded the country with money and also exported conservative and often radical Wahhabi clerics. The Americans, aware of the relationship with the Saudis as well as Pakistan's secret program to build nuclear weapons, looked the other way. Washington sowed, unwittingly, the seeds of destruction in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It trained, armed and empowered the militants who now kill them.

The relationship, she said, bewildered most Afghans, who did not look favorably upon this radical form of Islam. Most Afghans, she said, wondered why American aid went almost exclusively to the Islamic radicals and not to more moderate and secular resistance movements.

"The population wondered why they did not have more credibility with the Americans," she said. "They could not understand why the aid was stopped in Pakistan and distributed to political parties that had limited reach in Afghanistan. These parties stockpiled arms and started fighting each other. What the people got in the provinces was minuscule and irrelevant. And how did the people see all this? They had great hopes in the beginning and gradually became disappointed, bitter and then felt betrayed. This laid the groundwork for the current suspicion, distrust and disappointment with the U.S. and NATO."

Dr. Fournot sees the American project in Afghanistan as mirroring that of the doomed Soviet occupation that began in December 1979. A beleaguered Afghan population, brutalized by chaos and violence, desperately hoped for stability and peace. The Soviets, like the Americans, spoke of equality, economic prosperity, development, education, women's rights and political freedom. But within two years, the ugly face of Soviet domination had unmasked the flowery rhetoric. The Afghans launched their insurgency to drive the Soviets out of the country.

Dr. Fournot fears that years of war have shattered the concept of nationhood. "There is so much personal and mental destruction," she said. "Over 70 percent of the population has never known anything else but war. Kids do not go to school. War is normality. It gives that adrenaline rush that provides a momentary sense of high, and that is what they live on. And how can you build a nation on that?"

The Pashtuns, she noted, have built an alliance with the Taliban to restore Pashtun power that was lost in the 2001 invasion. The border between Pakistan and Afghanistan is, to the Pashtuns, a meaningless demarcation that was drawn by imperial powers through the middle of their tribal lands. There are 13 million Pashtuns in Afghanistan and another 28 million in Pakistan. The Pashtuns are fighting forces in Islamabad and Kabul they see as seeking to wrest from them their honor and autonomy. They see little difference between the Pakistani military, American troops and the Afghan army.

Islamabad, while it may battle Taliban forces in Swat or the provinces, does not regard the Taliban as a mortal enemy. The enemy is and has always been in India. The

balance of power with India requires the Pakistani authorities to ensure that any Afghan government is allied with it. This means it cannot push the Pashtuns in the Northwest Frontier Province or in Afghanistan too far. It must keep its channels open. The cat-and-mouse game between the Pakistani authorities and the Pashtuns, which drives Washington to fury, will never end. Islamabad needs the Pashtuns in Pakistan and Afghanistan more than the Pashtuns need them.

The U.S. fuels the bonfires of war. The more troops we send to Afghanistan, the more drones we send on bombing runs over Pakistan, the more airstrikes we carry out, the worse the unraveling will become. We have killed twice as many civilians as the Taliban this year and that number is sure to rise in the coming months.

"I find this term 'collateral damage' dehumanizing," Dr. Fournot said, "as if it is a necessity. People are sacrificed on the altar of an idea. Air power is blind. I know this from having been caught in numerous bombings."

We are faced with two stark choices. We can withdraw and open negotiations with the Taliban or continue to expand the war until we are driven out. The corrupt and unpopular regimes of Hamid Karzai in Afghanistan and Asif Ali Zardari are impotent allies. The longer they remain tethered to the United States, the weaker they become. And the weaker they become, the louder become the calls for intervention in Pakistan. During the war in Vietnam, we invaded Cambodia to bring stability to the region and cut off rebel sanctuaries and supply routes. This tactic only empowered the Khmer Rouge. We seem poised, in much the same way, to do the same for radical Islamists in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

"If the Americans step up the war in Afghanistan, they will be sucked into Pakistan," Dr. Fournot warned. "Pakistan is a time bomb waiting to explode. You have a huge population, 170 million people. There is nuclear power. Pakistan is much more dangerous than Afghanistan. War always has its own logic. Once you set foot in war, you do not control it. It sucks you in."

Mr. DREIER. Well, I guess for a different reason my friend from Ohio is going to be joining us in opposition to this rule, and I very much appreciate that.

Mr. KUCINICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCINICH. Well, of course I will be voting against the rule. I want the war to end.

Mr. DREIER. I understand. I appreciate the gentleman joining us, as I say, for a somewhat different reason than ours. We all want this war to end, there's no doubt about that, but we also want to ensure success.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very good friend from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule. I offered an amendment yesterday to address an injustice against the members of our armed services that were shut out by this proposed rule.

Briefly, my amendment would have increased the across-the-board military personnel pay for 2009 from 3.9 percent

to 4.4 percent. This pay raise would have been effective retroactively from January 1, 2009.

According to estimates by the Congressional Research Service, the pay gap between military personnel and civilians in comparable positions is 3 percent. Particularly during a recession, it is unacceptable that our men and women in uniform receive less than their civilian counterparts.

I was just in Afghanistan over the weekend and had the opportunity to meet and work with the wonderful committed and professional group of men and women in the military. They've been serving us to keep us safe and to establish the stability in the Middle East. But given this shortfall in pay, I thought it was appropriate to provide for our troops some supplemental income in this supplemental appropriations bill. Unfortunately this rule would not even allow an up or down vote on my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this continued abuse of process. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to say, the gentlewoman has offered an extraordinarily thoughtful amendment which reaffirms our dedication to our men and women in uniform. Especially as Memorial Day approaches, it seems to me that we should have an open amendment process that would allow us to fully debate the Biggert amendment. And it saddens me that this structure around which we are considering this issue is so restricted.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank you.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time does each side have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 13½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have so many concerns about this supplemental, I don't know where to start. But I'm going to start at one point. And I believe the most important point is, this supplemental keeps us involved in Iraq, and it sets up an unending occupation of Afghanistan.

The cost of the supplemental is just too great without a defined stated mission, without redeployment plans. We're going to look at an endless military presence in Afghanistan. That will just serve to fuel anti-Americanism throughout the region, and it will continue to promote the instability.

Sadly, the rule does not provide Members a chance to remedy the situation. Proposals providing accountability and transparency from my colleague BARBARA LEE, from JIM MCGOV-

ERN, from JOHN TIERNEY actually haven't had a chance for an up or down vote. It could have made a difference when we voted on the floor today.

The American people deserve much better than that. I urge my colleagues to oppose this funding and promote a foreign policy based on SMART security, humanitarian assistance, development and diplomacy.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking new Member with a very, very distinguished career in public service, the gentleman from Aurora, Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) who has said, and I agree with him, that we can make this bill a better bill if we open up the amendment process. I certainly agree with my colleague from the great State of Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) who says that this is not a perfect bill.

One provision of this bill gives U.S. taxpayer dollars to the Gaza Strip in the aftermath of the fighting between Israel and Hamas for reconstruction aid. It does this by giving \$119 million to the United Nations. In 2004 Peter Hansen, then commissioner-general of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency remarked that, "I am sure that there are Hamas members on our payroll, and I don't see that as a crime. Hamas as a political organization does not mean that every member is a militant. And we do not do political vetting and exclude people from one persuasion against another."

Hamas is a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization. The United Nations might not consider having Hamas members on their payroll a problem, but it certainly is a problem for the United States and Israel.

The supplemental before us provides up to \$119 million to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to spend in Hamas-controlled Gaza, which means that Hamas members on the U.N. payroll will effectively be on the U.S. payroll.

I intend to vote against this rule because it does not allow the chance to amend this provision. I filed an amendment that would have instead provided \$119 million for humanitarian relief to go to USAID. The rule before us would bar this amendment from being offered.

I appreciate the attempt at additional oversight placed on the U.N. in this supplemental, but it is simply too little too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you.

I wrote Secretary Clinton in March, along with 21 of my colleagues, noting there is no way to spend money in Gaza without inappropriately benefiting Hamas. Unfortunately out of the several ways to save money that might inappropriately benefit Hamas, we are choosing one of the worst.



Mr. Speaker I would urge a “no” vote on the previous question and a “no” vote on the rule.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Colorado, it's good to see you here.

I would just say on page 55 of the bill, there is a provision that says that no funding, no assistance is to be provided to or through any individual, or private or government entity, that advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity.

With that, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Also let me thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for their hard work on this bill and for including provisions that I offered, prohibiting the establishment of permanent bases in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I opposed the 2001 resolution authorizing the use of force because it gave President Bush and any future President an open-ended blank check to wage war anywhere on the globe, starting in Afghanistan.

Nearly 8 years later, I continue to oppose the supplemental appropriations bills for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq because it continues us down the wrong path and can lead to war without end. Unfortunately this will continue to happen if we don't repeal that 2001 authorization.

I oppose this \$94 billion supplemental because it favors military activities over diplomatic, development and reconstruction efforts by a ratio of 9-1. Afghanistan will not be stabilized through military action.

As noted by the Carnegie Endowment, the presence of foreign troops is the most important element driving the resurgence of the Taliban. This is counter to our national security interests. This does not include an exit plan for Afghanistan. It does not fully fund the redeployment of troops out of Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much for yielding.

This does not prohibit the drone attacks. It does not include a strong regional approach, which the situation demands, including a strong nuclear nonproliferation effort in Pakistan.

The supplemental appropriations bill does not reflect a new direction. Therefore, I cannot support it.

Let me just mention that our friend and colleague Congressman PETE STARK is unable to be here today for this important debate. So I wish to conclude by reading one sentence from his statement. He said, “President Obama is moving America's foreign policy in a better direction, and he has shown superior judgment to President Bush on when we should send our

troops into harm's way. However, I cannot support any more funding for these wars.”

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 10¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of my colleague how many speakers he has remaining on his side of the aisle?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have at least three.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of that, I would ask my friend to proceed, and I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend Mr. PERRIELLO from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as someone who was very critical from the beginning of the Iraq war but nonetheless am supportive of the supplemental before us.

I believe we stand at a promising moment, a promising moment in terms of the trends in Iraq and a promising moment in terms of having a leader in the White House who understands the challenges before us to get Afghanistan right.

Having been on the ground there in previous years, I can assure you that the questions that were not being asked before are being asked now. It's not going to be an easy struggle there. But I say to my more progressive colleagues who are very critical of this that we should give ourselves a little credit. The era of arbitrary power in the Bush doctrine really ended with the '06 election. A new period of smart power, led with General Petraeus and Secretary Gates, has moved us in a direction of real national security, not Hollywood security. This is an important move, and it's a move that continues today.

That change was only solidified by the 2008 election. We have people who are deadly serious about getting national security right in Iraq and Afghanistan, who understand the military's job is to back up a political solution and are looking for that, who understand that we cannot solve the situation in Afghanistan without dealing with corruption internally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to extend my friend 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PERRIELLO. We will not solve Afghanistan without dealing with corruption internally and with Pakistan externally. And finally, we have a President who's negotiating from a position of strength, not weakness, unlike the last two administrations.

So I rise today with a grave seriousness about the supplemental before us but also a sense that we're on the right track with this new national security strategy. I believe that it is the right thing to do to support it.

□ 1315

Mr. DREIER. I reserve my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like now to yield 1 minute to my friend from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the underlying supplemental appropriations bill. Frankly, I am undecided on the rule.

I returned from Afghanistan just a couple of days ago, and I could see firsthand the passion and commitment of our servicemen and -women, our diplomats and other civilians. But I want them to know that this debate that we are having here today is not about them. It is about the direction that we need to proceed. I saw the commitment and courage of Afghan women to build a future for their country. But this supplemental appropriations bill will not get us there. Let me quote, “Given its terrain, poverty, neighborhood and tragic history, Afghanistan in many ways poses an even more complex and difficult long-term challenge than Iraq, one that, despite a large international effort, will require a significant U.S. military and economic commitment for some time.” Those are the words of Secretary Robert Gates, and not my own.

And yet here we are today prepared to commit our servicemen and -women to a war without end, placing them in harm's way without a plan for being there and a strategy for leaving Afghanistan. I understand that we want to give our President an opportunity to work out a mess that he inherited but did not create. Unfortunately, this Congress and this President have to be honest with the American people—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield the gentlewoman 30 additional seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. We have to be honest with the American people that this is not an in-and-out military operation. Winning requires a long-term, sustained commitment to turn 90 percent illiteracy to literacy, grow food products instead of producing heroin and opium, build a civil society and rule of law. We need a plan while we are there and a strategy for leaving. We don't have it. And I will be voting against the supplemental.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to again inquire of my friend, does he have two speakers remaining?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have three speakers remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I will reserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both sides have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Ohio, Congresswoman SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership. Today we consider the last war supplemental providing funding for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, I am deeply

concerned that this bill does not have an exit strategy for military operations in Afghanistan. Out of fairness to our brave soldiers, we cannot have an open-ended strategy. And I support the bill introduced by Representative JIM MCGOVERN to require one.

This bill does have some provisions in it that I support. Since October of 2001, approximately 160,000 soldiers have been subject to stop-loss orders, serving on involuntary extended tours of duty.

Last June, I introduced the Stop-Loss Compensation Act to ensure that all our soldiers affected by the policy would be properly compensated. And last fall we took the first step toward fulfilling our duty to these brave soldiers by including stop-loss compensation for fiscal year 2009 in the continuing resolution. But today I am proud that we will extend the \$500-a-month payments to all 160,000 soldiers that have been affected by stop-loss since 2001.

And, Mr. Speaker, on the home front, our firefighters who answer the call of duty in communities throughout this country are often the first on the scene and the last to leave. Because of the current recession, a lot of communities, including the community of Elyria in my district, are being forced to lay off firefighters, resulting in staffing levels that are too low.

I am proud to say that we have worked on language to include in this bill that will allow SAFER grants to be used to rehire and retain much-needed firefighters. The Elyria Fire Department has already informed me that with this change, they plan to apply for a SAFER grant to reinstate the 10 firefighters who were laid off last month.

This bill will help us ensure that stop-loss payments for those who protect us overseas will be properly given and to ensure the adequate staffing for those who protect us at home.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will inquire again of my friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I have two more. I have two 1-minute speakers.

Mr. DREIER. Then you will close. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would yield 1 minute to my friend from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, "mission accomplished." If this were so, then continuous funding for combat is not needed. However, resources for our military withdrawal is. The supplement as a means of financial support for continuing conflict is a very deceptive technique. Funding should be in the budget since it appears that there is no end to the conflict in Iraq. Combining food assistance, AIDS, farm loan programs, refugee assistance in this bill will give the bill the votes needed for passage. But humanitarian issues should be in separate legislation. They are too important to be dumped in this bill.

To make my point, I will not vote for any war funding that deprives my con-

stituents of the domestic funding needed to improve their lives. The rule is the passageway for this injustice.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me, at this time, yield 4 minutes to the extraordinarily patient author of the amendment about which we have been speaking dealing with the issue of Guantanamo, my good friend and classmate from Vienna, Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. I want to thank Mr. DREIER for the time.

I rise in opposition to the rule. I had an amendment which dealt with the Guantanamo Bay issue. And let me sort of lay it out. There are several issues really involved. One, there are Uyghur detainees at Guantanamo Bay that Eric Holder was prepared to release into the United States. This is not a Khalid Sheik Mohammed that we are transferring to release in the neighborhoods in the United States.

Who are the Uyghur detainees? They are members of a group called the Eastern Turkistan Islamic Movement. Many of them have been trained in al Qaeda training camps in Tora Bora. Now, that is something that the American people should know. Also, their leader is a man named Abdul Haq. Haq is on the terrorist list of the U.N. The Obama administration also put him on their terrorist list last month. And yet Eric Holder is saying, and some people believe he was ready to do it 2 weeks ago Friday, to release them, to release them with Federal pay, if you will, so they can live on the environment, go to the shopping malls, do whatever, release them in the United States, without even telling the Congress anything.

Now, Congress cannot be like Pontius Pilate and sort of wash our hands and say, you know, we don't want to be involved in this. We don't want to know. If something happens, it is your responsibility. The Congress, the United States Congress and the American people want us to be involved. That is why they sent us here. So that is the Uyghurs, Eastern Turkistan Islamic group, terrorists, Tora Bora, Abdul Haq.

The other one is they want to move some of these terrorists like Khalid Sheik Mohammed that Mr. DREIER mentioned to the United States. Now, he is the one, he is the one who beheaded—beheaded Daniel Pearl. He was the mastermind of 9/11 which killed 30 people from my district. Now, is it okay for Eric Holder to say, well, we are not going to give you a report? And it just so happens that no Member of Congress—Eric Holder has refused to allow the FBI career people to come up and brief the Congress. Now if Attorney General Ashcroft had prohibited the FBI from coming up to brief Senator LEAHY, this place would be up in arms. But Holder is prohibiting the FBI up until maybe next week to come up and brief on this issue.

Now, everyone said, well, we can hold him without any trouble. Okay. Great. But don't forget, Officer Pepe was

stabbed in the eye by one of these guys at the World Trade Center—in the eye up in Attica. And don't also forgot the sheik, the blind sheik, Rahman, was proceeding sending information out with regard to his lawyer.

And lastly many people forget but the terrorists who were in American prisons were in communication to the Madrid bombers, with the Madrid bombing. But Eric Holder said, we are not going to give you a report. And do you know what? The Congress said, we don't want a report. We don't really want to be involved. We really don't want to know. So you go ahead and do whatever you want to do.

And lastly this: everyone in Guantanamo is medium to high security. The others have been released. Of the others that have been released, 61 have come back on the terrorist field, terrorist attacks against us and against our men and women in uniform. That is the low level guys.

These are the medium and high. So what we wanted to do is say that Congress ought to be involved. We didn't get into whether or not you close Guantanamo Bay or not. We were not stopping that. We were just saying, let's give us a report. Let's let the American people know. If the Congress doesn't want to know, let the American people know about whoever may be released in their neighborhood. They will at least know.

And lastly the Governors and the State legislators ought to participate. For that reason, this amendment should have been made in order whereby we could debate it to say, do you want these people to be released or do you want them to be retransferred? And should the Congress be involved?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I always supported the efforts in Afghanistan. But last weekend I went to Afghanistan. And as much as I want to support the country and I want to support this bill, I cannot. The problems there are overwhelming. Ninety percent of the women are illiterate and a huge majority of the men. Twenty-five percent of the children die before age 5. Thirty years of war has devastated any possibility of leadership in that country. Women are abused and beaten. Drug addiction is rampant. There is corruption in the government and corruption in the military.

In Afghanistan we were told it would take 10 to 15 years to turn this country around—10 to 15 years. So we either go full throttle or we just say, okay, because we can't just string it along like we did in Vietnam. Their needs are far more than one country can give. If other nations would stand up and do what we have done and give the same commitment of their people and their talent, Afghanistan could turn this around. And we could help them. But the world won't adopt Afghanistan. And we cannot be a single parent there.

Our focus now has to be Pakistan, the greater risk.

And so I will not be able to support this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one more speaker, Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, for 1 minute.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and for the supplemental. In Wisconsin we have had the largest call-up, the largest redeployment of our guard units since the Second World War. Many of our companies in western Wisconsin have had deployment ceremonies, tremendous sacrifices that our troops are making as well as their families to serve our country. This supplemental ensures that they get the tools and the resources and the equipment that they need to do their job as safely and as effectively as possible. It is the least we can do given what they are doing for us.

I also want to commend the dean of the Wisconsin delegation, the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY, because he recognized the huge shortfall when it came to Farm Service Administration loans for our family farmers. The demand was exceeding the authority that we gave them to give out these ISA loans which is important for them to have so they can buy the seed so they can plant it in the ground and stay in business. And 47 of the 50 States were reaching shortfalls in this manner. It was brought to Mr. OBEY's and others' attention, and they took immediate action in order to rectify it before we had a wholesale reduction in family farming throughout the country. So I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the supplemental.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman will be closing for his side?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for my Republican colleagues when I say that when President Obama said that he wanted to work in a bipartisan way, we would agree when it was the right thing to work with him in a bipartisan way.

Clearly, supporting our men and women who are daily stepping forward and volunteering to help us in the effort to prosecute this ongoing struggling against radical extremism deserves bipartisan support. So we are pleased that President Obama has made this request. We all hope, as Memorial Day approaches 1 week from Monday, we all hope very much that we are able to see this war come to an end. And we all want to see our men and women come home just as soon as we possibly can.

It is unfortunate that while President Obama has agreed to work with

Republicans in our quest to ensure that we have adequate funding and support for our troops, that the Democratic leadership has chosen to use a procedure that is, unfortunately, one that we never once used when we were in the majority in dealing with a wartime supplemental. This is a closed rule that denies us a chance to offer the very, very thoughtful amendment that Mr. WOLF has come forward with.

□ 1330

It's clear, for those who heard our colleague from Vienna speak from this well about the deliberation that he took in crafting this amendment, that it's one that should be considered by this full House. But, unfortunately, the rule that is before us denies that.

Our colleague from Hinsdale, Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) had a very, very needed amendment that would increase the compensation level for our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, this rule denies a chance for that to be considered.

The distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Somerset, Kentucky, of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security (Mr. ROGERS), had his amendment that would have allowed for a transfer to deal with the pressing need that exists on our southern border, to secure it so that the drug cartels that are moving throughout Mexico killing literally thousands and thousands of people, so that we're able to protect ourselves from that. We are not even allowed to debate that amendment that Mr. ROGERS, a hardworking member of the Appropriations Committee, brought forward.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we should do is defeat the previous question. And if Members who are committed to allowing for congressional involvement to deal with this difficult issue of Guantanamo, if they share that concern, Democrats and Republicans, we should join to defeat the previous question.

If I'm successful in my quest to defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to substitute Mr. OBEY's inadequate language on the Guantanamo detainees with Mr. WOLF's far more robust solution to the detainee problem.

And, again, to be very specific, Mr. Speaker, the Wolf amendment would require real risk assessments on the dangers of releasing Guantanamo detainees into our local communities. It would require the consent of governors and State legislatures before the Guantanamo detainees are sent here, and it would require a certification that bringing detainees on U.S. soil won't create legal repercussions that could result in terrorists roaming freely on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the application of the Wolf amendment has the effect of extending beyond the end of this fiscal year by requiring a detailed report in advance of any releases or transfers, while Mr. OBEY's language

would allow terrorists to be released into the wild of our local communities without a second thought anytime after October 1.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the full language of the amendment in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question if they're committed to dealing responsibly with the Guantanamo issue and, if we're not successful with that, to vote "no" on the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I think I will begin where my friend from California just left off, and that's with the Guantanamo issue, which I think has been blown way out of proportion because in the amendment that is proposed as part of this rule, none of the funds made available in this or any prior act may be used to release an individual who is detained as of April 30, 2009, at the Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, or the District of Columbia. It goes on to say that the President shall submit to the Congress in writing a comprehensive plan regarding the proposed disposition of each individual who is detained as of April 30, 2009, at Guantanamo Bay.

So this amendment provides precisely what they're concerned about. So their complaint is one that completely baffles me, and all the rhetoric and the histrionics attached to it as the potential for terrorists running amok in the streets simply is not accurate under this amendment or this supplement.

But the real purpose of the supplemental appropriation deals with several other things. Let's begin with wildfire suppression, making sure that firefighters can receive different kinds of grants for rehiring and personnel purposes; border enforcement, there's additional funding so that the border enforcement along the Mexican border is beefed up, as it was within the stimulus bill. There's additional funding for narcotics trafficking. We deal with the influenza as part of this supplemental, farming.

But then the most important and the real key to this supplemental deals with our troops. And it begins with allowing additional funds for stop-loss so that those people who have had to stay in the military beyond their original tours of duty get an additional \$500 a month. There is a potential pay increase, and there is funding for warriors in transition. We had the terrible incident a few days ago of one of our troops killing a number of others because of the stress that comes from these war zones. So there's additional funding for that. Then, of course, the additional funding for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. We require reports as to how things are proceeding

towards the President's withdrawal date of August 31, 2010, from Iraq as well as requiring reports as to reconciliation and political consensus in Afghanistan.

I urge that my friends and my colleagues here in the Congress vote "yes" on the previous question and vote "yes" on the rule.

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 434 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

Strike "printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution" and insert "printed in the Congressional Record on May 12, 2009 and numbered 2".

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution \* \* \* [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2). Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question

on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the rule for H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2009. Clearly, this is an important bill and must be only amended with items that are essential to move clear the way for the assistance this country so greatly needs. I am saddened by the decision to make the rule a closed rule. Nevertheless, I support the rule and the underlying bill.

On May 4, Chairman OBEY released a summary of his initial mark of this legislation, reflecting the subcommittee's proposals. His mark provides a total of \$94.2 billion, about \$9.3 billion above the amended Administration request (\$83.4 billion in the initial April 9 request, plus \$1.5 billion for influenza preparedness requested on April 30, for a total of \$84.9 billion).

It adds \$3.2 billion for military construction, \$3.1 billion for C-17 and C-130 cargo aircraft, and \$3.2 billion for international affairs, with some offsetting reductions from the request elsewhere. This mark also provides \$2.0 billion for influenza preparedness, \$500 million more than requested.

#### AMENDMENT

Although it was a closed rule. I would have offered the following amendments.

While I am pleased to see more money going to support efforts by the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, our military, and our institutions managing foreign affairs; I want to ensure that funding that was already allocated is utilized.

In 2008, I worked with Congressman MURTHA and the Subcommittee on Defense to appropriate federal dollars for military personnel to receive assistance with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Having worked with Riverside General Hospital in my district, and learned of the many men and women suffering from PTSD; I formally requested and received FY08 funding for Riverside General Hospital to provide PTSD services to not only military personnel in Houston, TX but in the surrounding communities as well.

Due to unforeseen issues with the Department of Defense (DoD), the appropriated funding was never released from the Agency to the Hospital; and therefore services have yet to be rendered.

Therefore, to ensure legal authority for disbursement by DoD, I would like to have the funds allocated through Defense Health Operations & Maintenance in which case, the appropriate language should state:

"Of the funds provided for operations and maintenance for the Defense Health Program, the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 to Riverside General Hospital of Houston, Texas for services to treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders for active duty personnel, active duty dependents, National Guards, Reservist and military retirees with 20+ years of service discharged and/or on leave of duty."

I believe this small technical amendment would right a wrong and clear the way for previously allocated funding to be disbursed. This language would fall within the statutory authorities available to DoD and will allow Riverside General Hospital to make improvements to the hospital in order to provide post traumatic stress disorder treatment to our military personnel. Without this amendment, or another appropriate legislative vehicle the funding will expire effective September 30, 2009, and the Agency could not release any funding to the hospital nor could the hospital push forward with much needed care.

#### PTSD

Last year the rate of suicide in the military exceeded that of the general population, with at least 128 Army soldiers ending their own lives last year. The suicide count, which includes soldiers in the Army Reserve and the National Guard, is sadly growing, 15 deaths are still being investigated, and the vast majority of them are expected to be ruled suicides according to Army officials.

The new suicide figure compares with 115 in 2007 and 102 in 2006 and is the highest since current record-keeping began in 1980. These alarming statistics are partially due to never-before-seen stress with two wars and repeated, long tours of duty according to Army statistics.

The Army operates one of the largest and most diverse military posts worldwide in Texas at Fort Hood. There are more than 52,000 Soldiers currently assigned and 70,000-plus family members. In fact, one out of every 10 active duty Soldiers in the Army is assigned to Fort Hood and it is the largest single local location employer in the State of Texas—with more than 12,000 civilian employees; and this figure does not account for the additional number of Coast Guard, Navy, Marines, and Air Force personnel in the area.

My district and the surrounding area badly need the mental healthcare that Riverside General Hospital can provide to the countless military personnel in central and southern Texas. Therefore, I wanted this language to be attached to H.R. 2346.

#### PAKISTAN

I would also like to increase the amount of funding for Pakistan from \$400 million to \$600 million. This funding can be used for opportunities other than just war funding opportunities. For example, this increase in funding can be used to capacity and nation-building. This is important for the reconstruction of Pakistan.

Again, although these amendments were not included in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the

rules and adopting House Resolution 377.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 188, not voting 5, as follows:

## [Roll No. 261]

## YEAS—240

|                |                  |                  |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie    | Grijalva         | Neal (MA)        |
| Ackerman       | Gutierrez        | Oberstar         |
| Adler (NJ)     | Hall (NY)        | Obey             |
| Altmire        | Halvorson        | Oliver           |
| Andrews        | Hare             | Ortiz            |
| Baca           | Harman           | Pallone          |
| Baird          | Hastings (FL)    | Pascarell        |
| Baldwin        | Heinrich         | Pastor (AZ)      |
| Barrow         | Herseht Sandlin  | Payne            |
| Bean           | Higgins          | Perlmutter       |
| Becerra        | Himes            | Perriello        |
| Berkley        | Hinchev          | Peters           |
| Berman         | Hinojosa         | Peterson         |
| Berry          | Hirono           | Pingree (ME)     |
| Bishop (GA)    | Hodes            | Polis (CO)       |
| Bishop (NY)    | Holden           | Pomeroy          |
| Blumenauer     | Holt             | Price (NC)       |
| Boccieri       | Honda            | Quigley          |
| Boren          | Hoyer            | Rahall           |
| Boswell        | Inslee           | Rangel           |
| Boyd           | Israel           | Reyes            |
| Brady (PA)     | Jackson (IL)     | Richardson       |
| Braley (IA)    | Jackson-Lee      | Rodriguez        |
| Bright         | (TX)             | Ross             |
| Brown, Corrine | Johnson, E. B.   | Rothman (NJ)     |
| Butterfield    | Kagen            | Roybal-Allard    |
| Capps          | Kanjorski        | Ruppersberger    |
| Capuano        | Kaptur           | Rush             |
| Cardoza        | Kennedy          | Ryan (OH)        |
| Carnahan       | Kildee           | Salazar          |
| Carney         | Kilpatrick (MI)  | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Carson (IN)    | Kilroy           | Sarbanes         |
| Castor (FL)    | Kind             | Schakowsky       |
| Chandler       | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Schauer          |
| Clarke         | Kissell          | Schiff           |
| Clay           | Klein (FL)       | Schrader         |
| Cleaver        | Kosmas           | Schwartz         |
| Clyburn        | Kucinich         | Scott (GA)       |
| Cohen          | Langevin         | Scott (VA)       |
| Connolly (VA)  | Larsen (WA)      | Serrano          |
| Conyers        | Larson (CT)      | Sestak           |
| Cooper         | Lee (CA)         | Shea-Porter      |
| Costa          | Levin            | Sherman          |
| Costello       | Lewis (GA)       | Shuler           |
| Courtney       | Lipinski         | Sires            |
| Crowley        | Loeb sack        | Skelton          |
| Cuellar        | Lofgren, Zoe     | Slaughter        |
| Cummings       | Lowey            | Smith (WA)       |
| Dahlkemper     | Lujan            | Snyder           |
| Davis (AL)     | Lynch            | Space            |
| Davis (CA)     | Maffei           | Speier           |
| Davis (IL)     | Maloney          | Spratt           |
| Davis (TN)     | Markey (CO)      | Stupak           |
| DeFazio        | Markey (MA)      | Sutton           |
| DeGette        | Marshall         | Tauscher         |
| DeLauro        | Massa            | Teague           |
| Dicks          | Matheson         | Thompson (CA)    |
| Dingell        | Matsui           | Thompson (MS)    |
| Doggett        | McCarthy (NY)    | Tierney          |
| Donnelly (IN)  | McCollum         | Titus            |
| Doyle          | McDermott        | Tonko            |
| Driehaus       | McGovern         | Towns            |
| Edwards (MD)   | McIntyre         | Tsongas          |
| Edwards (TX)   | McMahon          | Van Hollen       |
| Ellison        | McNerney         | Velázquez        |
| Ellsworth      | Meek (FL)        | Visclosky        |
| Engel          | Meeks (NY)       | Walz             |
| Eshoo          | Melancon         | Wasserman        |
| Etheridge      | Michaud          | Schultz          |
| Farr           | Miller (NC)      | Waters           |
| Fattah         | Miller, George   | Watson           |
| Foster         | Mollohan         | Watt             |
| Frank (MA)     | Moore (KS)       | Waxman           |
| Fudge          | Moore (WI)       | Weiner           |
| Giffords       | Moran (VA)       | Welch            |
| Gonzalez       | Murphy (CT)      | Wexler           |
| Gordon (TN)    | Murphy (NY)      | Wilson (OH)      |
| Grayson        | Murphy, Patrick  | Woolsey          |
| Green, Al      | Murtha           | Wu               |
| Green, Gene    | Nadler (NY)      | Yarmuth          |
| Griffith       | Napolitano       |                  |

## NAYS—188

|           |              |             |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Aderholt  | Bachus       | Bilirakis   |
| Akin      | Barrett (SC) | Bishop (UT) |
| Alexander | Bartlett     | Blackburn   |
| Arcuri    | Barton (TX)  | Blunt       |
| Austria   | Biggert      | Boehner     |
| Bachmann  | Billbray     | Bonner      |

|                 |                 |               |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Bono Mack       | Harper          | Nye           |
| Boozman         | Hastings (WA)   | Olson         |
| Boustany        | Heller          | Paul          |
| Brady (TX)      | Hensarling      | Paulsen       |
| Broun (GA)      | Herger          | Pence         |
| Brown (SC)      | Hill            | Petri         |
| Brown-Waite,    | Hoekstra        | Pitts         |
| Ginny           | Hunter          | Platts        |
| Buchanan        | Inglis          | Poe (TX)      |
| Burgess         | Issa            | Posey         |
| Burton (IN)     | Jenkins         | Price (GA)    |
| Buyer           | Johnson (IL)    | Putnam        |
| Calvert         | Johnson, Sam    | Radanovich    |
| Camp            | Jones           | Rehberg       |
| Campbell        | Jordan (OH)     | Reichert      |
| Cantor          | King (IA)       | Roe (TN)      |
| Cao             | King (NY)       | Rogers (AL)   |
| Capito          | Kingston        | Rogers (KY)   |
| Carter          | Kirk            | Rogers (MI)   |
| Cassidy         | Kline (MN)      | Rohrabacher   |
| Castle          | Kratovil        | Rooney        |
| Chaffetz        | Lamborn         | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Childers        | Lance           | Roskam        |
| Coble           | Latham          | Royce         |
| Coffman (CO)    | LaTourette      | Ryan (WI)     |
| Cole            | Latta           | Scalise       |
| Conaway         | Lee (NY)        | Schmidt       |
| Crenshaw        | Lewis (CA)      | Schock        |
| Culberson       | Linder          | Sensenbrenner |
| Davis (KY)      | LoBiondo        | Sessions      |
| Deal (GA)       | Lucas           | Shadegg       |
| Delahunt        | Luetkemeyer     | Shimkus       |
| Dent            | Lummis          | Shuster       |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Lungren, Daniel | Simpson       |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | E.              | Smith (NE)    |
| Dreier          | Mack            | Smith (NJ)    |
| Duncan          | Manzullo        | Smith (TX)    |
| Ehlers          | Marchant        | Souder        |
| Emerson         | McCarthy (CA)   | Stearns       |
| Fallin          | McCaul          | Sullivan      |
| Filner          | McClintock      | Taylor        |
| Flake           | McCotter        | Terry         |
| Fleming         | McHenry         | Thompson (PA) |
| Forbes          | McHugh          | Thornberry    |
| Fortenberry     | McKeon          | Tiahrt        |
| Fox             | McMorris        | Tiberi        |
| Franks (AZ)     | Rodgers         | Turner        |
| Frelinghuysen   | Mica            | Upton         |
| Gallegly        | Miller (FL)     | Walden        |
| Garrett (NJ)    | Miller (MI)     | Wamp          |
| Gerlach         | Miller, Gary    | Westmoreland  |
| Gingrey (GA)    | Minnick         | Whitfield     |
| Gohmert         | Mitchell        | Wilson (SC)   |
| Goodlatte       | Moran (KS)      | Wittman       |
| Granger         | Murphy, Tim     | Wolf          |
| Graves          | Myrick          | Young (AK)    |
| Guthrie         | Neugebauer      | Young (FL)    |
| Hall (TX)       | Nunes           |               |

## NOT VOTING—5

|              |                |        |
|--------------|----------------|--------|
| Boucher      | Sánchez, Linda | Stark  |
| Johnson (GA) | T.             | Tanner |

## □ 1402

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, McHENRY, and MITCHELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TIERNEY changed his vote from “nay to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

## [Roll No. 262]

## AYES—247

|             |         |         |
|-------------|---------|---------|
| Abercrombie | Altmire | Baca    |
| Ackerman    | Andrews | Baird   |
| Adler (NJ)  | Arcuri  | Baldwin |

|                |                  |                  |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Barrow         | Hastings (FL)    | Oliver           |
| Bean           | Heinrich         | Ortiz            |
| Becerra        | Heller           | Pallone          |
| Berkley        | Herseht Sandlin  | Pascarell        |
| Berman         | Higgins          | Pastor (AZ)      |
| Berry          | Himes            | Payne            |
| Bishop (GA)    | Hinchev          | Perlmutter       |
| Bishop (NY)    | Hinojosa         | Perriello        |
| Blumenauer     | Hirono           | Peters           |
| Boccieri       | Hodes            | Peterson         |
| Boren          | Holden           | Pingree (ME)     |
| Boswell        | Holt             | Platts           |
| Boucher        | Hoyer            | Polis (CO)       |
| Boyd           | Inslee           | Pomeroy          |
| Brady (PA)     | Israel           | Price (NC)       |
| Braley (IA)    | Jackson (IL)     | Quigley          |
| Bright         | Jackson-Lee      | Rahall           |
| Brown, Corrine | (TX)             | Rangel           |
| Butterfield    | Johnson (GA)     | Reyes            |
| Capps          | Johnson, E. B.   | Richardson       |
| Capuano        | Kagen            | Rodriguez        |
| Cardoza        | Kanjorski        | Ross             |
| Carnahan       | Kaptur           | Rothman (NJ)     |
| Carney         | Kennedy          | Roybal-Allard    |
| Carson (IN)    | Kildee           | Ruppersberger    |
| Castor (FL)    | Kilpatrick (MI)  | Rush             |
| Chandler       | Kilroy           | Ryan (OH)        |
| Childers       | Kind             | Salazar          |
| Clarke         | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Clay           | Kissell          | Sarbanes         |
| Cleaver        | Klein (FL)       | Schakowsky       |
| Clyburn        | Kosmas           | Schauer          |
| Cohen          | Lance            | Schiff           |
| Connolly (VA)  | Langevin         | Schmidt          |
| Conyers        | Larsen (WA)      | Schrader         |
| Cooper         | Larson (CT)      | Schwartz         |
| Costa          | Lee (CA)         | Scott (GA)       |
| Costello       | Levin            | Scott (VA)       |
| Courtney       | Lipinski         | Serrano          |
| Crowley        | Loeb sack        | Sestak           |
| Cuellar        | Lofgren, Zoe     | Shea-Porter      |
| Cummings       | Lowey            | Sherman          |
| Dahlkemper     | Lujan            | Shuler           |
| Davis (AL)     | Lynch            | Sires            |
| Davis (CA)     | Maffei           | Skelton          |
| Davis (IL)     | Maloney          | Slaughter        |
| Davis (TN)     | Markey (CO)      | Smith (WA)       |
| DeFazio        | Markey (MA)      | Snyder           |
| DeGette        | Marshall         | Space            |
| DeLauro        | Massa            | Speier           |
| Dicks          | Matheson         | Spratt           |
| Dingell        | Matsui           | Stupak           |
| Doggett        | McCarthy (NY)    | Sutton           |
| Donnelly (IN)  | McCollum         | Tauscher         |
| Doyle          | McDermott        | Taylor           |
| Driehaus       | McGovern         | Teague           |
| Edwards (MD)   | McHugh           | Thompson (CA)    |
| Edwards (TX)   | McIntyre         | Thompson (MS)    |
| Ellison        | McMahon          | Tierney          |
| Ellsworth      | Meek (FL)        | Titus            |
| Engel          | Meeks (NY)       | Tonko            |
| Eshoo          | Melancon         | Towns            |
| Etheridge      | Michaud          | Tsongas          |
| Farr           | Miller (NC)      | Van Hollen       |
| Fattah         | Miller, George   | Velázquez        |
| Foster         | Mollohan         | Visclosky        |
| Frank (MA)     | Moore (KS)       | Walz             |
| Fudge          | Moore (WI)       | Wasserman        |
| Giffords       | Moran (VA)       | Schultz          |
| Gonzalez       | Murphy (CT)      | Waters           |
| Gordon (TN)    | Murphy (NY)      | Watson           |
| Grayson        | Murphy, Patrick  | Watt             |
| Green, Al      | Murtha           | Waxman           |
| Green, Gene    | Nadler (NY)      | Weiner           |
| Griffith       | Napolitano       | Welch            |
|                |                  | Wexler           |
|                |                  | Wilson (OH)      |
|                |                  | Woolsey          |
|                |                  | Wu               |
|                |                  | Yarmuth          |

## NOES—178

|              |              |                 |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Aderholt     | Bono Mack    | Cassidy         |
| Akin         | Boozman      | Castle          |
| Alexander    | Boustany     | Chaffetz        |
| Austria      | Brady (TX)   | Coble           |
| Bachmann     | Broun (GA)   | Coffman (CO)    |
| Bachus       | Brown (SC)   | Cole            |
| Barrett (SC) | Brown-Waite, | Conaway         |
| Bartlett     | Ginny        | Crenshaw        |
| Barton (TX)  | Burgess      | Culberson       |
| Biggert      | Burton (IN)  | Davis (KY)      |
| Billbray     | Buyer        | Deal (GA)       |
| Bilirakis    | Calvert      | Dent            |
| Bishop (UT)  | Campbell     | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Blackburn    | Cantor       | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Blunt        | Cao          | Dreier          |
| Boehner      | Capito       | Duncan          |
| Bonner       | Carter       | Ehlers          |

Emerson LaTourette Radanovich  
Fallin Latta Rehberg  
Filner Lee (NY) Reichert  
Flake Lewis (CA) Roe (TN)  
Fleming Lewis (GA) Rogers (AL)  
Forbes Linder Rogers (KY)  
Fortenberry LoBiondo Rogers (MI)  
Foxy Lucas Rohrabacher  
Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer Rooney  
Frelinghuysen Lummis Ros-Lehtinen  
Gallegly Lungren, Daniel  
Garrett (NJ) E. Roskam  
Gerlach Mack Royce  
Gingrey (GA) Manzullo Ryan (WI)  
Gohmert Marchant Scalise  
Goodlatte McCarthy (CA) Schock  
Granger McCaul Sensenbrenner  
Graves McClintock Sessions  
Guthrie McCotter Shadegg  
Gutierrez McHenry Shimkus  
Hall (TX) McKeon Shuster  
Harper McMorris Simpson  
Hastings (WA) Rodgers Smith (NE)  
Hensarling McNerney Smith (NJ)  
Herger Mica Smith (TX)  
Hill Michaud Souder  
Hoekstra Miller (FL) Stearns  
Hunter Miller (MI) Sullivan  
Inglis Miller, Gary Terry  
Issa Moran (KS) Thompson (PA)  
Jenkins Murphy, Tim Thornberry  
Johnson (IL) Myrick Tiahrt  
Johnson, Sam Neugebauer Tiberi  
Jones Nunes Turner  
Jordan (OH) Olson Upton  
King (IA) Paul Blumenauer  
King (NY) Paulsen Blunt  
Kingston Pence Boccieri  
Kirk Petri Boehner  
Kline (MN) Pitts Bonner  
Kratovil Poe (TX) Bono Mack  
Kucinich Posey Boozman  
Lamborn Price (GA) Wolf  
Latham Putnam Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—8

Buchanan Honda Stark  
Camp Sánchez, Linda Tanner  
Delahunt T. Wittman

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

## □ 1411

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 262, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 262 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

## RECOGNIZING ARMED FORCES DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 377, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MASSA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 377.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

Abercrombie Davis (IL) Jones  
Ackerman Davis (KY) Kagen  
Aderholt Davis (TN) Kanjorski  
Adler (NJ) Deal (GA) Kaptur  
Akin DeFazio Kennedy  
Alexander DeGette Kildee  
Altmire DeLauro Kilpatrick (MI)  
Andrews Dent Kilroy  
Arcuri Diaz-Balart, L. Kind  
Austria Ryan (WI) King (IA)  
Baca Dicks King (NY)  
Bachmann Dingell Kingston  
Bachus Doggett Kirk  
Baird Donnelly (IN) Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Baldwin Doyle Kissell  
Barrett (SC) Dreier Kline (MN)  
Barrow Driehaus Kline (MN)  
Bartlett Duncan Kosmas  
Barton (TX) Edwards (MD) Kratovil  
Bean Edwards (TX) Kucinich  
Becerra Ehlers Lamborn  
Berkley Ellison Lance  
Berman Ellsworth Larsen (WA)  
Berry Emerson Larson (CT)  
Biggart Engel Latham  
Bilbray Eshoo LaTourette  
Bilirakis Etheridge Latta  
Bishop (GA) Fallin Lee (CA)  
Bishop (NY) Farr Lee (NY)  
Bishop (UT) Fattah Levin  
Blackburn Filner Lewis (CA)  
Blumenauer Flake Lewis (GA)  
Blunt Fleming Linder  
Boccieri Forbes Lipinski  
Boehner Fortenberry LoBiondo  
Bonner Foster Loeb sack  
Bono Mack Foxx Lofgren, Zoe  
Boozman Frank (MA) Lowey  
Boren Frelinghuysen Lucas  
Boswell Fudge Luetkemeyer  
Boucher Gallegly Luján  
Boyd Garrett (NJ) Lummis  
Brady (PA) Gerlach Lungren, Daniel  
Brady (TX) Giffords E.  
Braley (IA) Gingrey (GA) Lynch  
Bright Gohmert Mack  
Broun (GA) Gonzalez Maffei  
Brown (SC) Goodlatte Maloney  
Brown, Corrine Gordon (TN) Manzullo  
Brown-Waite, Granger Marchant  
Ginny Graves Markey (CO)  
Buchanan Grayson Marshall  
Burgess Green, Al Markey (MA)  
Burton (IN) Green, Gene Marshall  
Butterfield Griffith Massa  
Buyer Grijalva Matheson  
Calvert Guthrie Matsui  
Camp McCarthy (CA)  
Campbell Gutierrez McCarthy (NY)  
Cao Hall (NY) McCaul  
Capito Hall (TX) McClintock  
Capps Halvorson McCollum  
Capuano Hare McCotter  
Cardoza Harman McDermott  
Carnahan Harper McGovern  
Carney Hastings (FL) McHenry  
Carson (IN) Hastings (WA) McHugh  
Carter Heinrich McIntyre  
Cassidy Heller McKeon  
Castle Hensarling McMahon  
Castor (FL) Herger McMorris  
Chaffetz Herseth Sandlin Rodgers  
Chandler Higgins McNerney  
Childers Hill Meek (FL)  
Clarke Himes Meeks (NY)  
Clay Hinchey Melancon  
Cleaver Hinojosa Mica  
Clyburn Hirono Michaud  
Coble Hodes Miller (FL)  
Coffman (CO) Hoekstra Miller (NC)  
Cohen Holden Miller, Gary  
Cole Holt Miller, George  
Conaway Honda Minnick  
Connolly (VA) Hoyer Mitchell  
Conyers Hunter Mollohan  
Costa Ingle Moore (KS)  
Costello Inslee Moore (WI)  
Courtney Israel Moran (KS)  
Crenshaw Issa Moran (VA)  
Crowley Jackson (IL) Murphy (CT)  
Cuellar Jackson-Lee (TX) Murphy (NY)  
Culberson Jenkins Murphy, Patrick  
Cummings Johnson (GA) Murtha  
Dahlkemper Johnson (IL) Murphy, Tim  
Davis (AL) Johnson, E. B. Myrick  
Davis (CA) Johnson, Sam Nadler (NY)  
Napitano

[Roll No. 263]

## YEAS—420

Neal (MA) Roskam Sullivan  
Neugebauer Ross Sutton  
Nunes Rothman (NJ) Tauscher  
Nye Roybal-Allard Taylor  
Oberstar Royce Teague  
Obey Ruppersberger Terry  
Olson Rush Thompson (CA)  
Olver Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)  
Ortiz Ryan (WI) Thompson (PA)  
Pallone Salazar Thornberry  
Pascrell Sanchez, Loretta Tiahrt  
Pastor (AZ) Sarbanes Tiberi  
Paul Scalise Tierney  
Paulsen Schakowsky Titus  
Payne Schauer Tonko  
Pence Schiff Towns  
Perlmuter Schmidt Tsongas  
Perriello Schock Turner  
Peters Schrader Upton  
Peterson Schwartz Van Hollen  
Petri Scott (GA) Velázquez  
Pingree (ME) Scott (VA) Visclosky  
Pitts Sensenbrenner Walden  
Platts Sessions Walz  
Poe (TX) Sestak Wamp  
Polis (CO) Shadegg Wasserman  
Pomeroy Shea-Porter Schultz  
Posey Sherman Waters  
Price (GA) Shimkus Watson  
Price (NC) Shuler Watt  
Putnam Shuster Waxman  
Quigley Simpson Weiner  
Radanovich Sires Welch  
Rahall Skelton Westmoreland  
Rangel Slaughter Wexler  
Rehberg Smith (NE) Whitfield  
Reyes Smith (NJ) Wilson (OH)  
Richardson Smith (TX) Wilson (SC)  
Rodríguez Smith (WA) Wittman  
Roe (TN) Snyder Wolf  
Rogers (AL) Souder Woolsey  
Rogers (KY) Space Wu  
Rogers (MI) Speier Yarmuth  
Rohrabacher Spratt Young (AK)  
Rooney Stearns Young (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen Stupak

## NOT VOTING—13

Boustany Jordan (OH) Sánchez, Linda  
Cantor Langevin T.  
Cooper Miller (MI) Serrano  
Delahunt Reichert Stark  
Franks (AZ)

## □ 1418

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 263 I was unable to record my vote. I intended to vote “yea” on that question.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1137

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's name from H.R. 1137.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 434, I call up the bill (H.R. 2346) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.